10 Rs. COURT FEE भारत INDIA दस रुपये TEN RUPEES CANCELLED

(1)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR, CHHATTISGARH **SINGLE BENCH**

M.C.C. 116 /2005

PETITIONER APPLICANTS : Madan Lal Sahu,
S/o Late Shri Shayam Lal Sahu,
Aged about 48 years, Presently working as Naib Tehasildar, in the Government of Chhattisgarh,
R/o Bagdehi para, Nawa para Rajim, District Raipur, C.G.

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS : 1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through the Secretary,
Department of Revenue,
Mantralaya, D.K.S. Bhawan ,
Raipur (C.G.)

2. The Secretary
Government of Chhattisgarh,
Department of General
Administration, Mantralaya,
DK.S. Bhawan , Raipur (C.G.)

3. State of Madhya Pradesh
Through the Secretary,
Department of General
Administration, Vallabh Bhawan,
Bhopal, (M.P.)

4. Union of India,
Through the Secretary,
Department of Personnel & Training, 3rd Floor, Lok Nayak Bhawan , Khan Market,
New Delhi

5. The Collector,
District Dhamtari,
Dhamtari, C.G.

P.R. No. 13 DEC 05
Presented by Shri Sanjay Nema Sahu
dated 6.12.05

RECEIVED COPY
6.12.05
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

THAKUR VIJAY SINGH
Asst. Solicitor General of India
CHHATTISGARH HIGH COURT
High Court Campus, Bilaspur (C.G.)

(2)

4

APPLICATION FOR CORRECTION OF TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR IN THE ORDER DATED 12/04/2005 IN WRIT PETITION NO. 4761 / 2004 , MADAN LAL SAHU VERSUS STATE OF CHHATTISGARH AND OTHERS.

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक .....MCC NO. 116. 05 **सन् 200**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	13-1-2006 Shri Satyendra Sahu, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Alok Bakshi, Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents No.1 and 2. Heard both the counsel. Vide order dated 12-4-2005 W.P. No.4761/2004 was disposed of with a direction that the petitioner should make a detailed representation to respondent No.2 within a period of two weeks and respondent No.2 was directed to consider the representation made by the petitioner and decide the same within a period of three months. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that competent authority is respondent No.1 and not respondent No.2. The petitioner has already made representation to the respondent No.1 which is not disputed by learned counsel for the State. Therefore, respondent No.1 is directed to decide the representation made by the petitioner within a period of 3 months considering all the points and grievances raised by the petitioner in accordance with law. With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. Sd/- L.C. Bhadoo Judge	
Barve		

SP/FS/2005 - 20,000

28-1-06